

WARREN HAVENS  
2649 Benvenue Avenue, Berkeley CA 94704  
510 914 0910 | wrnvnns (at) gmail (dot) com

*Filed with the FCC Secretary and by emails below*

October 10, 2017

Office of General Counsel  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Linda Oliver  
Assoc. General Counsel &  
Chief, Admin. Law Division  
[linda.oliver@fcc.gov](mailto:linda.oliver@fcc.gov)

Jacob Lewis  
Assoc. General Counsel  
Litigation Division  
[jacob.lewis@fcc.gov](mailto:jacob.lewis@fcc.gov)

David Senzel  
At OGC,  
Admin Law, EB 11-71  
[david.senzel@fcc.gov](mailto:david.senzel@fcc.gov)

Dear Ms. Oliver, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Senzel,

Re: EB Docket 11-71(the "Case," Closed), FCC 17M-35, and FCC 15M-14

For reasons below, I request that the interlocutory Order of ALJ Richard Sippel FCC 15M-14 be immediately dismissed at this time, in a written action by the Office of General Counsel with a statement that no findings or conclusions have been or will be made and no further actions by the Commission or any delated authority will be taken regarding the matters in FCC 15M-14.

FCC 17M-35, rel. Sept. 28, 2017, fully dismissed and closed the Case. I submit that the pending case components, FCC 15M-14 and the related appeal pleadings, are now moot and must also be dismissed and no finding or action may be pursued as to the moot, dismissed items.<sup>1</sup>

If FCC 15M-14 is not dismissed in accord with the above by the end of this coming Monday, October 16, 2017, then I intend to file in court for relief.

FCC 15M-14 removed me from the Case, and since then I have not been provided copies of Case filings and orders. I thus do not believe I need to copy any person on this letter. If you find otherwise, please explain. Also I do not waive any claim or position by this letter.

Sincerely,



Warren Havens

---

<sup>1</sup> Also, no notice and hearing opportunity was provided to me for the charges in and the severe, damaging sanctions imposed by this ALJ Order FCC 15M-14, and that violated required minimum due process of law rendering it void. See, e.g., *FCC v. Fox TV Stations, Inc.* 567 U.S. 239 (2012). Also, in my pending pleadings challenging this Order, other reasons are given that the Order is void, e.g., there was no public notice and comment when the gravamen cited rule §1.251(f)(3) was adopted, and it is based on evident falsehoods, and is arbitrary and capricious. However, the reason above is sufficient for this request.